



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,166	03/25/2004	Jari Vallstrom	NKO.032.US	6817
76385	7590	12/15/2008	EXAMINER	
Hollingsworth & Funk, LLC			AJAYI, JOEL	
8009 34th Avenue South				
Suite 125			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Minneapolis, MN 54425			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/15/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/809,166	VALLSTROM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	JOEL AJAYI	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on August 01, 2008. **Claims 1-37** are still pending in the present application. **This action is made FINAL.**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed August 01, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Cho does not disclose a device receiving a control command and adjusting an LPRF connection; a first unit that sends a control command to the device and has an LPRF connection with the device; another unit that has an LPRF connection with the device that has its connection with the device adjusted. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's statement and asserts that Cho discloses that the slave devices receive operational frequencies (control command) from the master device and they adjust their patterns to that of the master device (paragraph 6, lines 6-8); the master device sends the operational frequencies (control command) to the slave devices (paragraph 6, lines 6-8), and the master device is connected to the slave device (paragraph 7, lines 7-9). Bluetooth devices (including slave devices) communicate with one another (paragraph 5, lines 1 and 2); when a new connection is established with the slave device, the new connection is adjusted according to the operational frequencies (control command) received from the master device (paragraph 6).

Applicant argues that Cho does not disclose that the other LPRF connection operates on the same frequency band as the second LPRF connection. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's statement and asserts that Cho discloses that all the connections are

configured to frequencies set by the master device (paragraph 7, lines 1-3). This is within the 2.4 Ghz band/range as indicated by Hamalainen (paragraph 21, lines 1-4).

Applicant argues that neither Cho nor Hamalainen disclose a configuration of devices that establish LPRF connections. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's statement and asserts that Hamalainen discloses low power radio frequency networks, which consists of LPRF connections (paragraphs 12 and 18). Bluetooth is an example of a low power radio frequency network.

Applicant argues that Cho does not disclose that any of the slaves are informed about another connection being established; informing the first unit about establishment of the second LPRF connection. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's statement and asserts that Cho discloses that Bluetooth devices (including slave devices) communicate with one another (paragraph 5, lines 1 and 2); when a new connection is established with the slave device, the new connection is adjusted according to the operational frequencies (control command) received from the master device (paragraph 6). And the master device is aware of this because the slave device(s) communicate with the master device (paragraph 9).

Applicant argues that Cho does not disclose periodically pausing the established second LPRF connection activity and communicating with the first unit in order to resolve whether the first unit has control commands for adjusting the second LPRF connection activity. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's statement and asserts that Cho discloses that during the park mode the slave device periodically communicates with the master device to ask for maintenance of synchronization (paragraph 9), which includes the operational frequencies (control command) the master device sends that is used for adjusting the connections between

the slave device and the master device, and the slave device and another slave device (paragraph 5, lines 1 and 2; paragraph 6).

Applicant argues that Cho does not disclose informing the first unit when the second LPRF connection ends. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's statement and asserts that Cho discloses that the communication between the slave devices and the master device includes a time of operation; this indicates when the connection will end (paragraph 17, lines 5-9).

In view of the above, the rejection using Cho and Hamalainen is maintained as repeated below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

**Claims 1-37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cho (U.S. Patent Application Number: 2003/0045242)** in view of **Hamalainen et al. (U.S. Patent Application Number: 2002/0061744)**.

Consider **claim 1**; Cho discloses a method comprising: establishing a first Bluetooth connection with a first unit; establishing a second Bluetooth connection to a unit other than the first unit while maintaining the first Bluetooth connection with the first unit; receiving a control command from the first unit for adjusting activity of the second Bluetooth connection when another Bluetooth connection needs to be established by the first unit, the other Bluetooth connection operating on the same frequency band as the second Bluetooth connection (paragraph 7); and adjusting the second Bluetooth connection activity based on the control command received from the first unit (the master device, which controls the network, adjusts the connection whenever a slave device is added via a control command) (paragraph 6; paragraph 13, lines 3-8).

Cho fails to disclose establishing a wireless low power radio frequency (LPRF) connection.

In the same field of endeavor Hamalainen discloses establishing a wireless low power radio frequency (LPRF) connection (paragraph 12, lines 1-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hamalainen into the method of Cho in order to control wireless low power radio frequency networks.

Consider **claim 16**; Cho discloses a radio terminal equipment arrangement comprising: a cellular core unit and at least one peripheral unit, the cellular core unit (master device) being configured to communicate with a peripheral unit (slave device) using a Bluetooth connection, a peripheral unit being configured to establish an outside Bluetooth connection to a unit other than the core unit, wherein the core unit is further configured to give a control command for adjusting the outside Bluetooth connection activity of the peripheral unit when another Bluetooth connection needs to be established by the core unit, the other Bluetooth connection operating on the same frequency band as the outside Bluetooth connection of the peripheral unit (paragraph 7); and the peripheral unit is configured to adjust the outside Bluetooth connection activity based on the control command received from the core unit (the master device, which controls the network, adjusts the connection whenever a slave device is added via a control command) (paragraph 6; paragraph 13, lines 3-8).

Cho fails to disclose establishing a wireless low power radio frequency (LPRF) connection.

In the same field of endeavor Hamalainen discloses establishing a wireless low power radio frequency (LPRF) connection (paragraph 12, lines 1-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hamalainen into the method of Cho in order to control wireless low power radio frequency networks.

Consider **claim 31**; Cho discloses establishing a Bluetooth connection between a first and a second device (detection and synchronization to the received frequencies, by slave devices); giving a control command by the first device for adjusting activity of a second LPRF connection of the second device when another Bluetooth connection needs to be established by the first device, the other Bluetooth connection operating on the same frequency band as the second Bluetooth connection of the second device (paragraph 7); and adjusting the second LPRF connection activity of the second device based on the control command received from the first device (the master device, which controls the network, adjusts the connection whenever a slave device is added via a control command) (paragraph 6; paragraph 13, lines 3-8).

Cho fails to disclose establishing a wireless low power radio frequency (LPRF) connection.

In the same field of endeavor Hamalainen discloses establishing a wireless low power radio frequency (LPRF) connection (paragraph 12, lines 1-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hamalainen into the method of Cho in order to control wireless low power radio frequency networks.

Consider **claim 36**; Cho discloses a transceiver configured to communicate with a peripheral device using a Bluetooth connection (paragraph 26), and a controller configured to provide a control command for adjusting outside Bluetooth connection activity of the peripheral device when a new Bluetooth connection needs to be established by the cellular core device so that any outside Bluetooth connection activity of the peripheral device operating on the same frequency band as the new LPRF connection is adjusted accordingly (the master device, which

controls the network, adjusts the connection whenever a slave device is added via a control command) (paragraph 6; paragraph 13, lines 3-8).

Cho fails to disclose establishing a wireless low power radio frequency (LPRF) connection.

In the same field of endeavor Hamalainen discloses establishing a wireless low power radio frequency (LPRF) connection (paragraph 12, lines 1-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hamalainen into the method of Cho in order to control wireless low power radio frequency networks.

Consider **claim 37**; Cho discloses a transceiver configured to establish a Bluetooth connection with a first unit and a second Bluetooth connection with another unit other than the first unit while maintaining the first Bluetooth connection with the first unit; and a controller configured to adjust the second Bluetooth connection activity based on a control command received from the first unit via the transceiver (the master device, which controls the network, adjusts the connection whenever a slave device is added via a control command) (paragraph 6; paragraph 13, lines 3-8).

Cho fails to disclose establishing a wireless low power radio frequency (LPRF) connection.

In the same field of endeavor Hamalainen discloses establishing a wireless low power radio frequency (LPRF) connection (paragraph 12, lines 1-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hamalainen into the method of Cho in order to control wireless low power radio frequency networks.

Consider **claims 2, 32**; Cho discloses establishing the other LPRF connection (new connection) by the first unit (master device) after the second LPRF connection activity has been adjusted (paragraphs 6 and 7).

Consider **claim 3**; Cho discloses that before establishing the second LPRF connection (in order to construct a new connection), the method further comprising informing the first unit about the second LPRF connection being established (paragraphs 6 and 7).

Consider **claim 4**; Cho discloses periodically pausing the established second LPRF connection activity (hold mode) and communicating with the first unit during the pause in order to resolve whether the first unit has control commands for adjusting the second LPRF connection activity (park mode) (paragraph 9).

Consider **claim 5**; Cho discloses using Bluetooth sleep mode techniques (hold, sniff, park) in order to resolve whether the first unit has control commands for adjusting the second LPRF connection activity (paragraph 9).

Consider **claim 6**; Cho discloses that the other LPRF connection being established is between the core unit (master device) and a peripheral unit (slave device) (paragraph 6).

Consider **claim 7**; Hamalainen discloses that the other LPRF connection being established between the core unit and the same peripheral unit that establishes the outside LPRF connection (printer) (paragraph 8, lines 5-9; paragraph 23, lines 8-25).

Consider **claim 8**; Hamalainen discloses that the other LPRF connection being established between the first unit and a unit other than a peripheral unit of the radio system (external telecommunication network) (paragraph 8, lines 5-9).

Consider **claims 9, 33**; Cho discloses the step of adjusting the second LPRF connection comprises decreasing the power of the second LPRF connection (power saving modes) (paragraph 9).

Consider **claims 10, 34**; Cho discloses the step of adjusting the second LPRF connection comprises restricting use of the second LPRF connection (the device are allowed to transmit and receive data only for a predetermined period of time) (paragraph 9, lines 7-9).

Consider **claims 11, 35**; Cho discloses that the step of adjusting the second LPRF connection comprising pausing the outside LPRF connection activity (paragraph 9).

Consider **claim 12**; Hamalainen discloses that the second LPRF connection or the other LPRF connection is a WLAN connection (paragraph 6 and 7).

Consider **claim 13**; Hamalainen discloses that the second LPRF connection or the other LPRF connection is a Bluetooth connection (paragraph 6 and 7).

Consider **claim 14**; Hamalainen discloses that the second LPRF connection established is a WLAN connection and the other LPRF connection established by the first unit is a Bluetooth connection (paragraph 6 and 7).

Consider **claims 15**; Cho discloses informing the first unit when the second LPRF connection ends (the master/core unit communicates and negotiates with the slave devices, this is done for a predetermined time period, therefore when the time period ends the master/core unit is informed) (paragraph 11).

Consider **claim 17**; Cho discloses establishing the other LPRF connection (new connection) by the core unit (master device) after the outside LPRF connection activity of the peripheral unit (slave device) has been adjusted (paragraphs 6 and 7).

Consider **claim 18**; Cho discloses that before establishing the outside LPRF connection (in order to construct a new connection), the method further comprising informing the core unit about the outside LPRF connection being established (paragraphs 6 and 7).

Consider **claim 19** ; Cho discloses periodically pausing the established outside LPRF connection activity (hold mode) and communicating with the core unit during the pause in order to resolve whether the core unit has control commands for the peripheral unit for adjusting the outside LPRF connection activity (park mode) (paragraph 9).

Consider **claim 20**; Cho discloses using a Bluetooth sleep mode techniques (hold, sniff, park) in order to resolve whether the core unit has control commands for adjusting the outside LPRF connection activity (paragraph 9).

Consider **claim 21**; Hamalainen discloses that the other LPRF connection being established between the core unit (access point) and a peripheral unit (portable computer) (paragraph 23, lines 8-25).

Consider **claim 22**; Hamalainen discloses that the other LPRF connection being established between the core unit and the same peripheral unit that establishes the outside LPRF connection (printer) (paragraph 8, lines 5-9; paragraph 23, lines 8-25).

Consider **claim 23**; Hamalainen discloses that the other LPRF connection being established between the core unit and a unit other than a peripheral unit of the radio system (external telecommunication network) (paragraph 8, lines 5-9).

Consider **claim 24**; Cho discloses the step of adjusting the outside LPRF connection comprising decreasing the power of the outside LPRF connection (power saving modes) (paragraph 9).

Consider **claim 25**; Cho discloses the step of adjusting the outside LPRF connection comprising restricting use of the outside LPRF connection (the devise are allowed to transmit and receive data only for a predetermined period of time) (paragraph 9, lines 7-9).

Consider **claim 26**; Cho discloses that the peripheral unit is configured to adjust the outside LPRF connection by pausing the outside LPRF connection activity (park mode) (paragraph 9).

Consider **claim 27**; Hamalainen discloses that the outside LPRF connection or the other LPRF connection is a WLAN connection (paragraph 6 and 7).

Consider **claim 28**; Hamalainen discloses that the outside LPRF connection or the other LPRF connection is a Bluetooth connection (paragraph 6 and 7).

Consider **claim 29**; Hamalainen discloses that the outside LPRF connection established by the peripheral unit is a WLAN connection and the other LPRF connection established by the core unit is a Bluetooth connection (paragraph 6 and 7).

Consider **claim 30**; Cho discloses informing the core unit when the outside LPRF connection ends (the master/core unit communicates and negotiates with the slave devices, this is done for a predetermined time period, therefore when the time period ends the master/core unit is informed) (paragraph 11).

### *Conclusion*

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Joel Ajayi whose telephone number is (571) 270-1091. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30am to 5:00pm and Friday 7:30am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

*Joel Ajayi*

**/Lester Kincaid/**

**Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617**